UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

War and the Canons of Force - - - - - - - - - *Henry W. Pinkham*

Higher Considerations - - *Ellen Horup*

Fighting Those Who Want the Same Things - - - - - - - - *John Malick*

Concerning Our Attitude Toward Japan - - - - - - - - *Alan Jenkins*

The Study Table

VOLUME CXX NUMBER 6

Chicago, November 15, 1937

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL

Notes 87
Jottings— J. H. H. 89

ARTICLES—

War and the Canons of Force—HENRY W. PINKHAM 90
Higher Considerations—ELLEN HORUP 93
Fighting Those Who Want the Same Things—JOHN MALICK ... 95
Concerning Our Attitude Toward Japan—ALAN JENKINS 97

POETRY—

Exemplars—ROBERT WHITAKER 92

THE STUDY TABLE—

Control of the Mediterranean—TARAKNATH DAS 98
What's Coming in Europe?—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 99
Prophets and Poets—C. A. HAWLEY 100

THE FIELD—

Women Demand Disarmament as Only Safety—*Women's Peace Union* 86
Nazis Visit Our Church—DILWORTH UPTON 100
Good News from Russia—ANNA LOUISE STRONG 100

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Women Demand Disarmament as Only Safety

Members of the Women's Peace Union, holding as their cardinal principle a belief in the sacredness of human life, are dedicated to personal refusal to support any war whatever. Collectively, they work for the passage of the Independent Disarmament Amendment (commonly called the Frazier Amendment because it was introduced into Congress by Senator Lynn J. Frazier of North Dakota). The text of this Amendment to the Constitution is as follows:

> War for any purpose shall be illegal, and neither the United States nor any State, Territory, association or person subject to its jurisdiction shall prepare for, declare, engage in, or carry on war or other armed conflict, expedition, invasion, or undertaking within or without the United States, nor shall any funds be raised, appropriated or expended for such purpose.

Recently this organization sent the following letter to President Roosevelt about the Nine-Power Conference in Brussels:

> My Dear Mr. President:
>
> Realizing the wonderful opportunity created by the forthcoming Belgian Conference, we urge you to instruct our delegates to demand the immediate and complete disarmament of all nations.
>
> You who realize so well the state of the world must know that nothing less will serve not only our interests but the interests of the peoples of all nations.
>
> You alone can effectively make this demand.
>
> We write as an organization primarily concerned with the sacredness of human life, and with the spiritual growth which will be possible only when human life is not conscripted to the service of economic expediency and the lust for power. Of course, under present conditions, it is futile to talk of safety or defense of any people anywhere. Disarmament alone can protect life.
>
> To us of the Women's Peace Union, all armed nations are criminal nations. Some are worse than others, but there is no time to waste distinguishing between murderers and assassins.
>
> Let the United States, then, demand of this Conference immediate and complete disarmament. Let it also prove its high purposes by abolishing its armed forces, and relying instead upon constructive non-resistance for genuine defense.
>
> With deep appreciation of all that you will do toward these ends,
>
> Sincerely yours,
> MISS TRACY D. MYGATT,
> *for the Women's Peace Union.*

(*Continued on page* 100)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXX MONDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1937 No. 6

TEMPUS IN EXCELSIS

The Hour of Armageddon booms
With more portentous sound
Than ever thunder shocked the stars,
Or flames engulfed the ground.

Who wills to stay, who wills to flee
A crisis so immense?
To live, or die, at such a time,
Which were the more offense?

—ROBERT WHITAKER.

THANKSGIVING!

We are glad that we are not one of the unhappy mortals charged with the official task of writing a Thanksgiving proclamation this year. This task has not been easy any year since 1914. And the reason is that there is little in our modern world to stir the feeling of gratitude in any heart. Why should we pretend to be thankful when we are worried, unhappy, frightened, perhaps desperate? O yes, as individuals, we may be thankful that we are not as myriads of other men—hungry, sick, homeless, afflicted, terrorized, slaughtered. But this prayer seems no sweeter in our mouth than the prayer of the Pharisee in the scriptures. O yes, as Americans, we may be thankful that wars and rumors of wars are far away, and our land still richly blessed. But such thoughts are stifled by companion thoughts of China, Spain, Germany, Poland, the Jews. The cry of thanksgiving seems to us this year to be either selfish or else hypocritical. How can it be otherwise in honesty? Yet the festival is at hand, and we suddenly remember that, in the old days, thanksgiving to God was always tempered by confession of sin. In the book of Psalms, ringing with hallelujahs, there are the penitential prayers. Always, in the truly religious heart, there is the recollection that, while God is good, man is all too undeserving. There *is* a message, therefore, for Thanksgiving Day! Were we charged with the task of a proclamation, we should remind the people of their sins and call them to repentance. God still blesses us, above all with his beneficent rule of righteousness. But if we will not heed his divine will, which is the moral law, even God cannot save us nor even spare us. The plight of our world is the record of our shame—it is our own guilt come upon us. Hence to thee, O God, do we cry, that thou wilt help us to save ourselves, to learn and to do thy holy will ere it be too late, to seek peace and pursue it, that we may not perish but may rather live to praise thy name forever and forever.

ITALY IN SPAIN

Mussolini is playing a clever game in the Spanish negotiations. Refusing at first to consent to any withdrawal of alien troops from Spain except on a man-to-man basis, which is ridiculous because of the huge excess of Italian troops in the peninsula, Il Duce then makes a sweeping concession, so-called, which involves a commission of inquiry and of course an indefinitely prolonged period of time for this commission to inquire. Meanwhile, Franco goes right on winning his war with all the help that Mussolini can possibly give him! After precious months of time, all this may come to something—some kind of a beginning of some kind of a withdrawal of foreign troops from the civil war. But as a condition of all this is Mussolini's insistence, graciously conceded by Britain and France, that Franco be given recognition as a belligerent. The importance of this move is beyond all calculation—for the Rebels! It would win the war for them in short order. For the Loyalist government of Spain is absolutely dependent upon foreign supplies not only for munitions for the army but also for food for the people. Belligerent rights would give Franco the right to declare a blockade, and he has the ships to enforce such a blockade. This would mean the shutting off of indispensable food supplies and of oil and gasoline. H. L. Brailsford, in an essay in Sherwood Eddy's new book, *Europe Today,* describes from his own experience in Spain the extremity of the Valencia government in the matter of these supplies, even in these days when forts are open. Shut off these supplies, says Brailsford, and "you have doomed governmental Spain to starvation. * * * Even if the new scheme of non-intervention were faithfully carried out, even if all volunteers were withdrawn, and if on the other hand, the right of blockade were recognized, I am afraid that the balance would be to Franco's advantage." Here, obviously enough, is Mussolini's game. Cleverly he is setting his trap—and, at this present writing, Britain and France seem to be preparing to tumble in. One thing is absolutely sure—nothing else is worth thinking about at all!—and that is that Mussolini proposes to win this war in Spain for the Fascists.

Little Red Ridinghood did not know that it was a wolf she had to deal with. Is our world to be similarly naive?

GOVERNMENTS THAT RUN AWAY

We are getting sick at heart, and sick in the stomach too, at the ever-recurring spectacle of governments running away from war when the tide of battle goes against them, and leaving the people to bear the brunt of defeat. The fall of Gijon in Spain was heralded by aeroplanes dropping down across the French border laden with officials of the Asturias government. Later despatches told of the capture by the Rebels of numerous trawlers making for the French coast with municipal and other functionaries aboard. At the same time we read dreadful stories of a burning city, looted by brigands, and crowded with hundreds of thousands of starving, frightened, and helpless people. When Malaga some months ago similarly fell to the victorious Franco, the same thing happened—the government fled, and men, women, and children stayed behind to meet their conquerors. When the fall of Madrid seemed imminent last year, the Loyalist government—President, Prime Minister, and all the rest—went scurrying away to Valencia. Political officials are sensitive creatures, and can't work happily with the sound of battle in their ears! But the humble citizens of Madrid have been left all this time to survive as best they can under the guns and bombing-planes of the besiegers. All of which makes us sick! What would we think of a military commander who ran away when his army was in retreat? What do we think of a captain who leaves the bridge and passengers of a sinking ship? What should we think of a president, a governor, a mayor, who eggs on the people to fight to the last ditch, and then deserts the last ditch himself? It is the government, let it be remembered, that makes the war. The people have nothing to do with the war, except to fight it. All the people ask is to be left alone in their homes and fields and with their children, and to have peace. But no!—they are forced into the trenches, and left to die there when the government gets frightened and skeedaddles. The Spaniards, we have no doubt, are a heroic people. But their officials are cowards! If this is the Loyalist Spain we have heard so much about, we ask to hear less. Yet these officials are not unique—they are the common governmental breed! Hence our belief that there is no remedy of war quite so sure as the idea of putting the governments, instead of the people, in the trenches, and letting the government fight it out!

"ADVANTAGES OF WAR"

A remarkable book was published some time ago at Geneva. A disheartening book, too! The volume is a study of war-sentiment in Germany, and consists simply of documents which are left to tell their own story. For example, there is a survey of school text-books, for teachers, or pupils, or both, which are now commonly in use in the Reich. In one such text-book, *Der Deutsche Aufsatz,* by Oberstudienrats Dr. A. Vögeler, appears the following scheme of a paper on the "Advantages of War":

> Advantages of war. I. For the State: (1) War is an antidote against the rotten herbs of peace, where rationalism sends everything to sleep by overcoming idealism; (2) when patriotism is awakened the holy fire of the enthusiasm for the Fatherland is set alight; (3) the victors acquire a predominant position of force, of prestige and of influence, which is their reward; the vanquished are not dishonoured, if they have defended themselves bravely; (4) peoples learn to know one another and to respect each other, the exchange of ideas and viewpoints is facilitated; (5) commerce seeks new channels, which often are profitable; (6) the arts flourish, and poesy and painting particularly find excellent subjects.
>
> II. For the citizen: (1) War supplies occasions for the development of talent, and without war there can be not so many great men in the world; (2) war gives the possibility of displaying virtues; (3) the religious sentiment is awakened in the conqueror as well as in the conquered; (4) active people amass fortunes; (5) to die for the Fatherland is sweet, and the conqueror remembers those who fell in battle.

Here is poison for the minds of children, gently administered by the school-system of a country which has suffered more terribly from war than any other modern nation. And this is only one sample among many! That Germany is the only country engaged in this business is not to be believed for a moment. An examination of text-books in France, Italy, Jugo-Slavia, Poland, would reveal, we fear, a very similar situation. Which means that a whole new generation of Europeans is being reared in the ideas that produced the most ghastly war in human history! That another war must follow upon such training is inevitable, unless . . . unless *what?* Unless some miracle delivers us? Miracles don't happen. And, if they did, they would have to happen fast and furious to overcome the influences of such education as this.

FREE SPEECH

Bishop McConnell declares that free speech is seriously threatened in this country. He feels that we are destined in the next ten years to have a fiercer fight on our hands for civil liberties than any we have known in our lifetime. He sees signs of growing intolerance in churches and colleges, and anticipates increasing bigotry and passion in the political field. We know of no wiser public leader than the Bishop. He is as sane as he is brave, as cool as he is determined. He makes no rash statements, and never indulges in sensationalism. When he speaks thus, he has reason for so speaking, and we do well to take heed. What alarms us in the present situation is the attack upon liberty from two sides, left and right. The hostility of the reactionaries on the right is of course to be expected, and we think

can be handled. Fascism is with us in this country in spirit, but we are confident it can be beaten off, after however fierce a fight, and our basic rights preserved. The real peril comes from the left, from the radicals and even liberals who have no more use for free speech and the unhindered exercise of civil liberties than the tories have. The Communists of course make no bones of despising freedom. The C. I. O., in its strike campaigns last summer, had no more regard for the rights of employers than these employers had for the rights of labor. Heywood Broun, honored liberal, wrote not so long ago that the time had come to pull down the windows of our minds! If this is to be the temper of our radicals and liberals, if these also are going to be hostile to or even careless of free speech and other democratic principles, then we might as well reconcile ourselves to the fact, first as last, that our fight is lost. Civil liberties cannot survive a battle on two fronts. Perhaps this is what Bishop McConnell had in mind in his grim forecasting of the future.

THE CHURCHES AND THE MASSES

Our friend, R. H. Markham, of Budapest, has been traveling in the Balkans and studying the churches in this region of many lands, races, and religions. He finds noble and inspiring Roman Catholic edifices in cities and villages, but describes them, in his report in the *Christian Century,* as "very far from the real life of suffering, frustrated millions in Central Europe." The Eastern Orthodox churches he describes as "more museums than a living, uplifting, transforming power." But there are Protestant churches in these countries—"Presbyterian, Lutheran, and Unitarian communities of long standing and much prestige." Surely these are different? But Mr. Markham hardly finds them so. He agrees that they "have rendered high spiritual service to millions of men and women" since the Reformation. But today, he continues, "most of these churches seem to be little more than relics. The highway of modern life seems to have taken another direction, leaving them, noble and distinguished, on a neglected byway." It may well give pause to us liberals to note that not only are Protestant churches generally included with Roman and Greek churches in this unhappy judgment, but that among the Protestant churches are specifically included the Unitarian. Is it true that there is no distinction between these Unitarian churches and the Presbyterian and Lutheran? There must be distinction—theologically! The Unitarians undoubtedly stress the unity of the Godhead as against the orthodox trinitarian conception. But is there distinction in matters that really count? Are the Unitarian churches near to the people, and are they serving their moral and social needs? Mr. Markham says no—"they have not satisfied the need of awakening masses, nor dared to lead multitudes of thwarted men and women toward a better order." This is a verdict to be taken seriously to heart—especially as applied to our own country, for here also the churches are under indictment. To what extent are the churches of Channing, Parker, and Jenkin Lloyd Jones, right here in America, "little more than relics"?

Jottings

Off and on, all summer, we mulled over the tercentenary volume of Harvard College—the great and gorgeous book describing the unforgettable exercises in celebration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of the institution. Always, as we turned the pages, read the text, studied the illustrations, always something seemed to be strange, unreal. At last we discovered what it was. Here was a volume descriptive of college activities—and in all the hundreds of pages not a picture or a mention of an athletic team!

We are tired of polite words. The Russian word "liquidate" gives us an especial pain. Why not say *"murder,"* and be done with it?

Mark Twain's *Tom Sawyer* has just been banned in Brazil as a specimen of "seditious literature." It's Communist propaganda. Which reminds us that our edition of the classic *is* bound in red!

Was there ever a time when so many persons attempted to solve so many questions by calling names? If you disagree with a man on your left, call him a "Red"; if you disagree with a man on your right, call him a "Fascist"! This is our modern substitute for thought. What an exhibition of intellectual and spiritual degeneracy!

Josef Stalin has been nominated for a seat in the Soviet Union's new nation-wide legislature in the first election under the new constitution on December 12th next. As a test of democracy in Russia, we shall watch to see how many candidates appear to run against Stalin.

High prices—*high prices?* What's all this complaint about high prices? Didn't President Roosevelt promise long ago to raise prices, and hasn't he done exactly what he said he would do?

J. H. H.

War and the Canons of Force

HENRY W. PINKHAM

An examination of the cases in which by general consent the use of force on human beings is necessary may disclose the elements they have in common and thus suggest canons of force, or rules for the coercion of fellow men. There are three classes that are regarded as properly subject to physical compulsion on occasion: first, young children; second, the feeble-minded and the insane; third, criminals.

Evidently little children in their inexperience need the guidance of parents, or nurses, or teachers; and at times, for the child's welfare, such guidance must be enforced. Thus strong arms must lift the child from a place of danger which it does not understand, despite the child's objection and resistance. Such physical control of young children involves no bodily injury to either party, so great is the disparity of strength, which matches the disparity of wisdom. As children advance in wisdom, parental control should diminish; and as they advance in stature, compulsion by physical force becomes another matter. When the boy is in his later teens, almost as heavy as his father and a good deal quicker, it will probably be best for the father to be content with moral suasion. If he tries force upon his boy, the consequences may be regrettable.

To the feeble-minded and the insane, society through carefully chosen agents should act the part of parents exercising such control, involving a measure of physical constraint, as wisdom and kindness dictate with regard both to the happiest possible condition of these unfortunates and to the social weal.

The control of criminals belongs to the police function of society, which is unquestionably indispensable. In this function judges and jailers are included as well as policemen. The policeman as the agent of society, himself guided by prescribed rules and not actuated by personal feeling toward the wrongdoer, represents the intelligence and morality prevailing in the community, which may not be very high but are at least considerably higher than the intelligence and morality of the criminals. The policeman's work is not very dangerous. His expectation of life is fair, considerably higher than that of a coal miner. Chosen in part for his physical strength, he is usually more than a match for the man he arrests. If need be, he can call on bystanders for aid, or can summon other policemen. Seldom is it his duty as a policeman to risk his life, although as in the case of the fireman such times may come and he ought to be in spirit always prepared to meet them. Judges who sentence criminals act in conformity with laws made for the common welfare and reflecting the general enlightenment. Jailers are society's agents, themselves under regulation in their treatment of criminals. This treatment is becoming more humane, with a curative object definitely in view, as science makes known the nature and causes of crime. The jail of the not distant future will be a moral hospital rather than a place of punishment.

This brief survey of the universally approved examples of the physical coercion of fellow men reveals three elements which they have in common, on which canons of force may be based. In the treatment of young children, of the feeble-minded and the insane, and of criminals, it appears, in the first place, that compulsion is justified because it is exercised by the superior upon the inferior, by the wise and good upon the relatively ignorant and evil, the compulsion being dictated by wisdom and kindness and regard for the general well-being, not by selfishness. In the second place, such compulsion is justified because it is exerted by the stronger upon the weaker—the overwhelmingly stronger in the cases looked at—with the result that little or no injury is done to either party. In the third place, the coercion is applied to individuals, and not to entire families or communities as such, composed as they are of various kinds of persons. Thus the convicted burglar's wife and children are not jailed with him.

Here, then, are three canons of force: compulsion should be employed (1) only by those who are unmistakably superior in wisdom and goodness, (2) only by those who are also much the stronger, and (3) only upon individuals as such.

To what extent are these rules for the use of force observed in war? One cannot begin this inquiry without sensing a vast difference between the examples already considered and that so-called use of force which is war. For war is the wholesale killing of fellow men. Parents may well require obedience on the part of young children. But they do not kill their children! It sometimes happens that a policeman kills a criminal, but such cases are unusual. Killing is not the policeman's job! General Leonard Wood said: "The business of the policeman is to control; the business of the soldier is to kill." Capital punishment, to be sure, still lingers, but it is clearly an anachronism. It belongs to the barbarity and ignorance of the past, not to the enlightenment and humanity of today. Thus it is a tremendous jump from the use of force familiar to us in time of peace to that monstrous thing, collective homicide, which is war. But it is so common to call war "the use of force," and to so many people war seems amply justified by the analogy of policing, that the inquiry proposed above is fully warranted.

Applying our first canon, then, we ask of what war it can truthfully be said that the one side was unmistakably superior in wisdom and goodness to the other side. Possibly certain wars have to a considerable degree met this criterion. Bertrand Russell, in an essay on the ethics of war, holds that various wars of conquest whereby civilized peoples have overcome savages and taken possession of their lands have been vindicated by their results. He insists that "there should be a very great and undeniable difference between the civilization of the colonizers and that of the dispossessed natives," and also "that the climate should be one in which the invading race can flourish." European colonists in America were doubtless more advanced than the Red Men they displaced. But the experience of Penn demonstrates that America might have been claimed for European civilization by peaceable means. There was plenty of room for both the Red Men and the colonists; and they could have lived side by side to the advantage of both, had Penn's kindness been the rule and not the exception. Probably the same is true of all the wars of colonization which Russell had in mind. The superior civilization might have been extended more effectively if violence had not been employed against the natives. Of course civilized people are far stronger in war than barbarians, and can sub-

jugate or exterminate them without themselves suffering great loss. Thus our second canon is to a degree followed.

However it may have been in the past, the conquest of savages by the civilized hardly belongs to the present-day problem of peace. Civilization has become world-wide—especially since Italian civilization has conquered Ethiopia! It is a war in which the great civilized nations are arrayed against one another that now menaces humanity, such a war as the World War. Now that so many years have passed since the armistice, and that at least some of the lies with which all the belligerent governments misled and inflamed their peoples have been purged from our minds, we see that neither side in that unprecedented conflict was clearly superior to the other in civilization, in wisdom, in righteousness. Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson, lecturing in the United States early in the World War, expressed the hope that Germany might be victorious on her eastern front and defeated on her western. The issue appeared then to be whether Russia or Germany was to dominate Europe. As between those two, few Americans in 1914 would have hesitated to prefer Germany. One government after another entered the fray, professing lofty aims and noble motives, not divulging secret bargains for sharing the spoils of victory. Last of all and with the least excuse of all—for we had had nearly three years in which to see what modern war is—our country entered the general madness and surpassed all the others in the splendid idealism of its avowed objects. How ridiculous it all was! But how tragic! Only omniscience could determine which side was superior to the other in enlightenment and morality. It is certain that whatever difference there was is negligible in comparison with the fact that in going to war both sides sank below the brutes, which do not kill their own species collectively and seldom individually.

In the World War, as in all major wars, our second canon was evidently violated. Neither side had such overwhelming strength as to make the conflict short and inexpensive. To be sure, six of the eight great military powers that possessed nine-tenths of the world's armament were combined against the other two; but nevertheless victory was long delayed and was achieved only at frightful cost to both sides, more lives being lost by the victor countries (including Russia) than by the vanquished. In the Covenant of the League of Nations it is sought to insure a great preponderance of strength to be exerted against a nation going to war contrary to its agreement. All the other nations in the League promise to combine against the offender. As if it were safe to assume that the offender would have not even one ally! Moreover there are single nations so immensely powerful that all the others combined could subdue one of them only at fearful cost. Our country at present could hardly be conquered by all the rest of the world.

The wars that can with most profit be considered by the people of the United States are our own two traditionally glorious wars, the Revolutionary and the Civil. Here are two cases of rebellion and secession. One was successful, and we glorify it. The other was put down, and we condemn it. (I speak as a Northerner, while not unmindful of southern sentiment.) Our secession from England was admirable. The secession of the southern states was detestable. The secession of Panama from Colombia in President Theodore Roosevelt's administration was excellent,—according to our government which did not delay in recognizing Panama's independence. The principle of self-determination, which President Wilson stressed in treating of the European situation, seems to justify the southern states in withdrawing from the Union. Norway withdrew peaceably from Sweden in 1905. Does any one think that Sweden ought to have made war on Norway "to preserve the union"?

Our fathers in the thirteen colonies had real grievances against the British government, and the Declaration of Independence is a noble statement of the rights of men. But there were able and eloquent champions of America in England. Patient appeal to the British sense of justice would eventually have brought relief from the evils which at their worst were slight compared with the suffering and loss involved in the war. The colonists were by no means unanimous in demanding independence. Many of the wisest and best among them opposed it. Some of Boston's finest families, their property confiscated, found refuge in Halifax. Certain revolutionary leaders had private reasons, not altogether creditable, for desiring a change of government. The war was a drain upon the wealth and the human stock of both countries. It checked the progress our fathers were making. It embittered feeling against the mother country, feeling which for a century and more demagogues deliberately inflamed when they wished to divert attention from their own iniquity. It glorified war in the minds of the American people and went far to make us ready for the frequent and needless wars in which we have since engaged. Had we remained politically united to England, we should have avoided the second war with England (1812); as a part of a much larger whole, the union of English-speaking peoples, we might have effected the emancipation of the Negro slaves without bloodshed; and we might have played a more useful part in world affairs than we have, with less of the self-conceit and provincialism that have characterized us.

Likewise of our Civil War, it is impossible now, more than seventy years afterwards, to maintain that either side was unmistakably superior to the other in wisdom and righteousness. It is high time for people in general to see that the Civil War was a failure, a mistake, a disaster, like every other war. It did not save the Union, except in outward form. On the contrary, it made a deep and wide chasm between the two sections, a chasm that seventy years have not obliterated. It did not emancipate the slaves, except on paper. It postponed their real emancipation, we cannot yet tell how long. It intensified the antagonism between whites and blacks.

Until there is genuine repentance for the Civil War, until our youth are taught the truth about that war and the truth about the needless and disgraceful Mexican War and Spanish-American War, and until the average American can at least listen tolerantly to the suggestion that even the sacred Revolutionary War was a misfortune, the cause of peace will make but slow progress among us. It is the opinions we hold regarding our own particularly cherished wars that afford the acid test of the intelligence with which we are devoted to peace, as we all claim to be.

In applying to actual wars the canons of force herein propounded, the third, that force is properly applicable only to individuals, has thus far not been mentioned. It is, however, of crucial value to those who would reach a right judgment concerning war in gen-

eral. Every war violates this third canon because every war involves in calamity great populations without discrimination between the innocent and the guilty. Burke's famous remark is here pertinent: "I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people." What Burke could not do, the warmad found it easy to do in the World War. For example, Germany was likened to a brigand, a thug, even a mad dog. But what was Germany? A people of seventy millions of men, women, and children, the vast majority of whom had no responsibility for the war. The children certainly were innocent, yet they were among the chief sufferers. War is the killing of good men by good men, of patriots by patriots, of choice youth from universities by choice youth from universities, of Christians by Christians, each side believing itself the champion of the right, each side in fact terribly misled. If war involved only instigators of war, such as ambitious rulers, intriguing diplomats, greedy armament manufacturers, and imperialistic traders and bankers, then a good deal could be said for it. But, unfortunately, these seldom get near the firing line!

The wise men who gave us our Constitution saw clearly the inapplicability of coercion to communities as such. One of the outstanding features of our Federal system, to which Bryce gave much attention in his study of the "American Commonwealth," is the fact that the Constitution makes no provision for the coercion of a state by the general government. But individual delinquents or wrongdoers within a state may be coerced. Said Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut, in discussing this point in the Convention: "If we should attempt to execute the laws of the Union by sending an armed force against a delinquent state, it would involve the good and bad, the innocent and guilty, in the same calamity." Senator Borah, in his resolution for the outlawing of war, presented to the Senate in February, 1923, referred to this notable feature of our government as follows: "Whereas in our Constitutional Convention of 1787 it was successfully contended by Madison and Hamilton that the use of force when applied to people collectively, that is, to states or nations, was unsound in principle . . ." This truth, embodied in the framework of our government, is very inadequately recognized by our people or any other. It is a vitally important truth for those who would rid their minds of current war fallacies. We personify a country, perhaps symbolize it by a figure that becomes familiar the world over, like that of John Bull or Uncle Sam. Having personified a nation, it is then easy for us to ascribe to it attributes and responsibilities that are personal, and to feel toward it as if it were a person of known character. Because of the action of a few men constituting what is called a government, we denounce an entire population—millions of men, women, and children—and proceed enthusiastically to kill them in the name of righteousness! They do the same regarding us, holding the same view of loyalty to government that we hold. Such a procedure is abysmally irrational. It is irrationality to the utmost, irrationality without stint or limit, amply justifying Bernard Shaw's alleged remark during the World War: "The longer I live, the more firmly I am convinced that the other planets use our earth as their lunatic asylum."

Judson Harmon, Attorney-General of the United States under President Cleveland, made a remark, much quoted at the time, that is pertinent to this discussion: "Guilt is always personal." A wrongdoing person can reasonably and righteously be restrained by physical force if moral suasion is inadequate. Such person has a body, the instrument of his misbehavior. Being a physical entity, he can be put into a prison cell. He has a neck on which the hangman's noose can tighten. But a vast collectivity cannot thus be dealt with. Germany may be personified, but personification provides no physical body that can be handcuffed, no collective neck that can be made to stretch a rope. We can kill well-meaning Germans, each German life having to be paid for by the life of one of our own men. If we have command of the sea, we can blight and stunt a generation of German children. But such procedure is not reasonable, not righteous. There is only one word for it, and that is *insanity*. We only stultify ourselves when we attempt to justify it by the analogy of policing wrongdoing individuals. The true analogue of the nation in this connection is not the individual but the nation on a small scale, that is, the municipality. And municipalities dwell side by side without a thought of collective conflict. The police of one city are never even dreamed of as a menace to the people of a neighboring city, a menace that must be guarded against by a police force of equal or greater strength. Police never fight the police of another city, but they coöperate against criminals.

It is plain that wars usually violate all three of our canons of force, in that neither side is clearly superior to the other in wisdom and goodness, neither side is overwhelmingly stronger than the other, and, as is always the case a multitude of innocent and well-meaning persons are involved in suffering and disaster. And, finally, it is fitting to note that both sides, the victorious and the vanquished, suffer and lose in the long run with approximate equality. This seems to indicate that the Moral Order finds approximately equal transgression on both sides.

Exemplars

You died in France, where you went forth to kill;
But you were killed;
The other man got you.
Some hero, who
Somewhere is an exemplar children praise.
Strange, there are two,
The man who killed you, and you who were killed;
And both exemplars! here, to you, they build
A school-house as memorial! what to him
Who got you first? nor left of you a limb
Where laughing, shrieking fell
His heaven-directed shell,
That made you twain exemplars; double praise
Must be his portion, since, however loth,
He made you both,
And thrilled two nations, in two worlds apart.
A school for you! for him?
Say a cathedral, where, when day grows dim,
Your ghost may go, leaving the children here
Who worship at your shrine,
And you may listen while some smug divine
Tells how God used the man who killed you then,
Your death the sign
He worked God's will, since he was spared! Amen!

—Robert Whitaker.

Higher Considerations

ELLEN HORUP

When the American Commission, headed by Senator Nye, was looking into the activities of the munition industries, several things were revealed that reflected none too flatteringly on the British Empire. When, to save her face, England too produced a commission she had learned her lesson. Whereas Senator Nye had been commissioned to ask to have the books of the concerns involved put at the disposal of the investigators, the canny Britons confined themselves to verbal inquiries. The highest considerations made it necessary to limit the scandal as much as possible. And this was done.

Sir Herbert Lawrence, the manager of Vickers Armstrong, vouchsafed however with cheerful cynicism his opinion, and his point of view might very well stand as motto for the entire war industry: "The opposition to the manufacturers of arms and their propaganda is due to an honest but somewhat mistaken and idealistic respect for the sanctity of life and the injustice of war . . ." But the lords and masters of the munition industries are certainly not hampered by such silly considerations. They have, in common with the military class, but one goal: War!

If in truth there existed an international law respected by all, and whose aim consisted in maintaining peace and understanding among the nations, neither the munition makers nor the military would be of any use whatsoever.

In order to obtain wealth even in time of peace, the munition industries must create an atmosphere of hate and strife, distrust and insecurity among the nations, and whenever they succeed in this aim their goods find a ready market. And the more their goods are sold, the more the insecurity grows, and the nearer comes war with sky-soaring profits for the war industry.

War industries do not employ the ordinary means for advertising. No large posters call public attention to the newest, most destructive grenade, or the most efficient explosive. Its methods are far more subtle, but extremely effective. For instance: one day a small, insignificant paragraph is to be found in the French papers, telling the reader that Germany has tried out a new type of gun and has resolved to equip her entire army with it. That this is a trumped-up tale is of no importance; French orders for the new model will be forthcoming immediately, with the result that the erstwhile fabrication is transformed into truth, for orders from Germany follow in the wake of those from France.

This see-saw is now known to everybody, as is also the underhand work of the munition industries during the Disarmament Conference in London, where they succeeded in sabotaging the Air Force Treaty, as pointed out to the British investigating commission by Noel Baker.

If you are yearning for war, you must prevent peace. If you want peace, you must understand the reasons of war.

The propaganda of the munition industries is nearly as highly developed, as far-reaching, and also as expensive as that of the British Intelligence Service. That every newly elected minister is apt to find some shares in munition factories waiting on his writing desk is without a doubt an exaggeration; but it is nevertheless a fact that several ministers, even while members of the Disarmament Conference, possessed shares in munition industries, which roused public opinion to such an extent that many of them, among others Sir John Simon, were forced to get rid of their shares.

It is estimated that the French Comité des Forges spends annually up to 75,000,000 frs. for propaganda purposes, and that the big French conservative newspaper *Le Temps* receives not less than 10,000,000 frs. out of this amount.

How well profits and patriotism get along together can easily be imagined. For instance, during the World War Germany suddenly found herself in need of sulphurate of carbon and advertised for it in Swiss newspapers. The French Government paid at that time 5,000 frs. for 10,000 kilos. But the Germans offered 50,000 frs.—a surplus gain of 45,000 frs., which the French producers could not resist. French sulphurate of carbon was later returned to the French trenches in the shape of poison gas fifteen times as deadly as chlorine.

Coöperation has been developed into a fine art among the governments, the banks, and the industries of war. Countries with no such industries have obtained loans if they promised to buy their arms from the lender. This traffic has cost the thrifty French nation a pretty penny. The best known example is perhaps the French loan to Imperial Russia, a predestined loss as predicted by Jaurès. Another example just as glaring is the French financial venture in furnishing means for the re-armament of Hungary, while at the same time a French general was complaining to the French Senate because Hungary was breaking the Versailles Treaty and was already able to raise an army of 300,000 against Czechoslovakia, who was an ally of France.

The capital invested in industries of war is in great part the capital of the nation and involves the commonwealth of the people to a large extent. The French firm Schneider Creusot, for example, owns coal and iron mines, blast-furnaces and steel-works, munition factories and banks in England, France, and Italy, as well as in nine other European countries. When at the end of the Great War, the English Vickers and the Armstrong group amalgamated, they had, so to speak, monopolized the entire armament industry of the British Empire, and had moreover a controlling interest in all shipbuilding wharves, railways, bridge and road constructions, and all other sorts of engineering enterprises, and—after still another amalgamation —also the English steel-corporation.

As already mentioned, Schneider Creusot has subsidiaries in England, Italy, and nine other European countries. Branches of the Vickers concern may be found all over the world: in the Terni Works of Italy, the steel works of Japan, in Ireland, Spain, Holland, Poland, and so on. The head manager, the abovementioned Sir Herbert Lawrence, is also the director of the Bank of Rumania.

The Mitsui concern is the biggest munition factory of the Far East. It possesses steel works, oil compa-

nies, aircraft plants, steamship companies, mines, banks, newspaper concerns, and large electric power plants. It is also the world's foremost producer of spun and woven silk. The Mitsui group controls more than 60 per cent of Japan's commerce.

I. G. Farbenindustrie means to Germany what the Mitsui concern means to Japan. It presents the most striking example of the enormous resources and industrial enterprises that are at the disposal of these big concerns.

In 1916 seven large chemical works formed a cartel. They secured a loan of 300-350 million gold marks and erected the Luna Works. They manufactured 400,000 tons of nitrogen, which is essential to the production of high explosives, artificial silks, and chemical manures. They repaid the loan in paper money, its value being at the time of the inflation 25.2 millions. Thus, the concern gained 275-325 million gold marks on the transaction. The produced nitrogen yields about 300 per cent in profit. The liquid coal they are now making costs them not more than 80 Reichsmarks to produce, and sells for 800. What they make out of medicine is still more fantastic. One kilo of Salvarsan, for instance, costs them 200 RM. and sells for 8,000.

In every country where the war industry is a main factor it has tied up a whole lot of other industries, first of all the four most essential to warfare: iron and steel mills, chemical and electrical works, and the oil refineries. But industries connected with the four already mentioned are also controlled by them: mines, engineering enterprises, railroads, banks, and newspaper concerns. And, finally, all the factories that, although engaged in such peaceful enterprises as producing perfumery and artificial silks, may easily be converted into makers of poison gases and high explosives.

The giant trusts with their enormous capitals and their armies of workers are of course a power in the state. They are in fact those higher considerations which no government can escape. In 1928 a League of Nations commission proposed that the governments should forward to the Secretary-General a list of the concessions granted to armament industries, including a description of the materials involved and also the names and addresses of the concessionaires. The English Government replied: "We have no such information, and it is highly improbable that those who have it will disclose it. We have no power to force them to give us this information, and very few governments would dare to introduce a law that obliged them to do so."

In the industry of war one meets the same efforts towards concentration as everywhere else in the capitalist community. A trust is no longer coöperation of a series of enterprises producing the same goods, and thus able to control the price within the boundaries of a certain country. A modern trust is a section of the entire economic structure, embracing all sorts of businesses and commercial enterprises and reaching far beyond the boundaries of any special country. The mutual relation of the trusts is a combination of competition and collaboration, both subordinate to the sole aim of the concerns in question, namely, the profits.

We have a fine example of this coöperation in the agreement between I. G. Farbenindustrie and the French Ministry of War and the French Company for Nitrogen Research. The Germans handed over all their patents to France and promised not to set up competing factories in France for the next 15 years. They even went so far as to send German civil engineers and chemists to France to teach her how to utilize the patents to the best advantage and to obtain the most effective poison gases. These events coincided with the German non-violent resistance to the French military occupation of the Ruhr district.

To get an idea of how a competitive battle whose outcome cannot be decided by monetary means may lead to war, one has but to consider the question of oil. From 1904 to the present day oil has been the all-important or, as in the case of the Chaco War, the sole reason of at least twenty wars or revolts. The two giant trusts, Standard Oil and Royal Dutch Shell, are by no means particular or over-conscientious in their methods.

The Matteotti murder case is known to everybody. It was generally surmised that he was done away with solely on account of his anti-Fascist ideas. This, however, is only half the truth. The following details will complete the picture.

The oil sources of Italy are scanty and she is entirely dependent on the two Great Powers, the United States of America and England, for oil. When Fascism came to power, both these countries tried to get the monopoly of the Italian trade. Standard Oil knew the value of bribery and found its way to Finzi, the Fascist minister, who knew it, too. And so it was Standard Oil that obtained the coveted monopoly. But while the manager of one of Standard Oil's subsidiaries, Sinclair, was already nourishing beautiful dreams of royal purple as King of Albany, a new angle was added to the matter.

The Shell concern (Sir Henry Deterding) had also long been waiting for a fat, juicy piece of the pie, and was not to be cheated out of it. And England had, through the Persian Oil Company, held the monopoly in Albany since 1920. The British Government, who possessed the controlling vote in Persian Oil, began to move. Revolution immediately followed, the Government was overthrown, and England's favorite, Achmed Zogu, elected himself dictator.

Meanwhile, the Shell Corporation had not been idle in Italy. They had got hold of a copy of the correspondence concerning the briberies and handed it over to the Socialist Party. Matteotti was commissioned to make a complaint in the Chamber. Carrying the documents in his portfolio, he set out on his errand . . . and was murdered en route by a Fascist mob, whose leader was one Dumini. Who had told the Fascists that Matteotti was in possession of the proofs? It has never been revealed; but one may easily make a guess when contemplating the consequences of this murder.

After the assassination of Matteotti the Shell Corporation and the British Empire had the situation well in hand. Publication of the briberies might have been fatal to Fascism just then, and Mussolini was compelled to annul the Sinclair contract and leave the monopoly in the hands of the Shell Corporation, while the English Government's interests in Albany were well guarded by Achmed Zogu. "The dagger of Dumini was hardened in the fire of American oil," writes the Swiss Socialist, Reinhard, in his pamphlet *Oil*.

The first real support rendered Hitler came from the most powerful man in the armament industry,

Thyssen. No wonder. It was all-important to him to see in power the man who in his book *Mein Kampf* pondered the question "How best to instill into the minds of 60 million people a common feeling of shame and hate till it bursts into an ever-spreading conflagration out of whose heat will rise one single, steeled intent and one single cry: 'Give us back our arms!'"

The author of *Hitler Over Europe,* Ernest Henri, describes in this book how Thyssen arranged everything. He persuaded industry to pay a certain amount to the electoral campaign of the National-Socialist Party by levying a special tax on all coal and steel works,—and, so as not to damage these industries, the price of coal was raised. Thus, the entire German population paid for Hitler's election campaign without knowing it.

The very first man outside of Germany who offered Hitler his assistance was no other than Sir Henry Deterding. The Soviets had confiscated his oil properties in Russia, and both he and Rockefeller had suffered enormous losses by Soviet Russia's oil competition in Europe. Communism was fast spreading in Germany, forcing her Socialist Government to favor Russia. Deterding saw in Hitler a splendid ally who had immediately put an end to the intercourse between the Red Army of Soviet Russia and the German Reichswehr. A re-armed Germany, with new gigantic road constructions and with a flourishing automobile industry, would enable Deterding to reconquer a fair part of the European market for the Shell Oil.

Big finance of the United States of America was also beginning to look askance at the German situation. Five bankers, representing Standard Oil and Shell, and others, were summoned to a conference in Wall Street. The opinion was that only a political revolt in Germany would be able to make better conditions for capitalist interests, and it was therefore resolved to send a trusted commissioner to Germany to negotiate with Hitler.

To the German nation Naziism means the same as does Fascism to Italy—an exploiting system to fill the coffers of big industry, the militarization of its entire population, and the standard of living reduced to its lowest level.

Industry, collectively speaking, has woven a net that spans the world, each single industry being but a knot in the fabric. The big trusts are stockholders of the banks, and the bank directors hold shares in the trusts. This system forms an invulnerable bulwark against the non-possessing classes and is never weakened by competition.

Whenever the munition industries claim that war is unavoidable, one may rest assured that all industries will profit by it.

In this capitalist world there no longer exists any sort of enterprise whose nationalism goes further than the consideration of profit. If the war industry seems to provoke public opinion more than the others, it is only because it offers the most glaring examples. But the atmosphere that breeds war is not created by it. On the contrary, the war industry is the effect. The capitalist system alone is responsible for that atmosphere. For a commonwealth that is not founded on necessities but on profit must inevitably lead to war.

In the hands of capitalist power national feeling has been shaped into a weapon, albeit this power does not even know the meaning of the word national feeling; nor for that matter of its caricature: nationalism. They are the unscrupulous powers representing those higher considerations that no government can escape—and they will finally decide the fate of Spain, in spite of her efforts and glorious heroism.

Fighting Those Who Want the Same Things

JOHN MALICK

It is nineteen years after. The usual processes of life have gone on, marriage, birth, and death. The population of Europe and America has changed at both ends. The old who mourned and agonized are not mourning and agonizing any more. Those who were fifty at the time are now sixty-nine; those sixty, now seventy-nine; those seventy, now eighty nine. At the other end are new people, all those nineteen or less, who came in at the close and know only what they have been told. Then between is the great body of us who have lived these intervening years, those twenty then, now thirty-nine; those thirty, now forty-nine; those forty, now fifty-nine. It is just these between, between those too young to have been born and too old to have remained until now, who have thought it over, read it over, come to whatever conclusions we have come to; extracted whatever wisdom is to be had from such an affair.

It all has been lived over and over again. Those large in it have written about it. The colored books have come out of the secret places of hearts and foreign offices, the national archives where repose the reasons why men fought and died, brought out after they have fought and died, the white, and red, and yellow, and black books, significant colors all, rich in connotation.

The "War Guilt" discussion added new sections to the libraries of the world. Those who write as of a time two centuries hence record that the documents piled up beyond the possibility of man to read them all. The question never was settled. It was forgotten; became obsolete; did not matter.

Those who are old enough will remember that nineteen years ago, just at this time, just as the shouting of victory was over, we closed for some weeks all the places where we gathered for any purpose and remained at home in anxious desolation. It was as if He that sitteth in the heavens laughed a sardonic laugh, or the old Lord of life said again, "Vengeance is mine." It was as if the older world, richer in experience, more fertile in resources, looked down upon these little human ants and said, "You tyros, you bunglers, you infants in playing with your instruments of death, if you are going to kill, let me show you how to do it. You noise-makers that fill the world with your din in your killing, let me show you how to do it, tick them off without a sound, as many millions as you killed with all your thundering; watch me, all as quiet-like as the trees come out and the sun goes down, no speech, nor language, nor voice heard." Whatever we call the larger Management, it gave a demonstration of what it

can do in depopulating the earth; gave it just at the time we were most in the mood to receive it, just at the time we had done our best to depopulate it in our own way. It all seemed to say, "You poor fighting infants of your little days and ways, you are all the same to me. I lay you low without preference, no sides to me, not a sound, nothing you can see," but effective beyond praise, so effective that in a few weeks the toll was beyond that taken by all our noisy instruments of death.

It is well to keep both these events in mind while we are remembering: when we were at our worst, and the part of the world that is not ours seemed at its worst, too; both these death-dealing times and the relation between them. It helps keep in mind just how strong we are and just how strong we are not, and whose world it is in a real test of strength.

Unbelievable changes have come in these nineteen years, unbelievable changes in the American and European mind. Self-chosen, self-styled guardians of the public mind will have it that the mind of 1918 is still the mind of America today and must continue to be, but it is not so. Material came thick and fast on which to exercise our minds, from 1918 on, revelations of the war years themselves and those that preceded. Added to this, enough in itself to disillusion the simplest and the shrewdest alike, are the events of these nineteen years, the stark disillusionment as to results said to come, dreamed would come, from the last war to end all war, to make democracy safe in all places for all time. Matchless, priceless years these, never so much to tell, never so many ways to tell it. You cannot feed minds with such things for nineteen years without starting some of them to work. They may not all be keen minds but it would require a level of human stupidity that cannot be depended upon as permanent to leave minds unchanged with such publicity of facts as these years have brought.

It is so great a change that there are few churches in the city that could give today what they gave nineteen years ago, as there were few then where could be given what will be given today. The change is so great that men publicly have repudiated what they said then. To read over the sermons, editorials, and books written then would be for the writers a chastening experience. The change is so great that there is almost complete reversal of attitude toward those who did not think the right way then and toward those who did. It seems almost shameless ingratitude, these so quickly fading reputations of most of the great names connected with the war. It is not quite fair. If there was shame, we put them to the shame. The judgment of our kind is a slow, sure-moving, brutal thing that forgets as shamelessly as these have been forgotten; detracts from reputation; lets down as quickly as these have been let down.

Those who have risen in these nineteen years in general approval are just those who were lowest then. Like a child's teeter, as their end has gone up, the other end has gone down. Certainly, no popular heroes ever have been subjected to such pitiless publicity at the hands of historian and biographer, mercilessly critical judgment. It is likely that the only names that will survive from the war, to be recalled gladly, will be those who did the most insanely foolish things then. History is as paradoxical as that.

We do not like being let down by those on our side. It was natural to say, "Disloyal," when the Russians decided to quit and go home. In old world affairs, the Allies were right. It was a reasonable thing to say that this was a treasonable thing. But in the light of developments, that was a great moment when they decided there was nothing in the war for them. Whosever war it was, they said, it was not theirs. Whether the decision was right or wrong, it brought an entirely new situation in war making, a new line-up: no kings in the old sense, a large middle-class group of countries, each watching the other and all watching the proletariat country, with some of the countries reverting to "absolute monarchy" under temporary kings of no royal house, suddenly risen from the middle group or bottom fellows.

We face the interesting fact that the bottom fellows saw first, and more quickly than the middlers, that there is nothing in war for them; that they are the dubs and always lose. From the oldest war to the last, their part was to fight and to fall and to pay, small sharers in the victory, large sharers always in the burden, whether victory or defeat. This gives us, as part of the world picture, a nation wise enough to see this and act upon it; to do what fighting they do over their own affairs; and, knowing their neighbors, wise enough to arm themselves up to first rank for the kind of war they know the next war will be. They know that their affairs require peace. This gives us a state bidding for peace on the ground of sheer self-interest, making the most daring overtures of peace to her old fighting mates of Europe.

There are certain stock ideas now current that are becoming the common possessions of intelligent minds, quite as well known as the findings of the most exact sciences. War now is known to be a public fire in which is burned the surplus product, in default of some way to get it to the living. As an economic measure, to dispose of a surplus margin, it is known to be self-defeating, killing both producers and customers, easing the glut only temporarily, calling for another burning before the ashes of the last have cooled. We know no way at present to speed up the birth of male children rapidly enough to man the wars necessary to dispose of our surplus. Economically, we require a new war before those have grown up who were born just at the close of the last.

It is coming to be known generally that we live on the capitalization of our debts, what we owe privately to one another, our notes and mortgages, and what we owe publicly or the public owes us. What we owe other nations and they owe us make our international exchange. We cannot quite get along in peace-time; and, in war, the debt is so large that the only way to make even a show of paying it, is to give some paper evidence of debt. War, by necessity, is paid for by a paper promise of more than possibly can be performed. Most private debts eventually will be repudiated. All war debts must be, not because nations are dishonest but because it is impossible. War has to be paid for with bad debts. This gives pause to the whole business.

Most people go on voting against those whose interests are quite like their own. There is considerable evidence that many are seeing this obvious truth. War in Europe is a rather plain case of people who live about the same way, the same kind of people, divided by yesterday's loyalties, while every interest of theirs calls them to be friends. One cannot cross from border to border of Europe without being struck with the likeness among them, home-loving, hard-working, peace-dwelling folk. Peculiarly, all of them are lovers of that

stability for home and acre that peace only can give. Here they are, always worked up to fighting pitch, in terror of the call to cross the border against those they have no reason to dislike. For most part, they believe what they are told and come when they are called. If half the effort were given telling them truthfully why they are friends that is given telling them falsely why they are enemies, it would lift untold burdens from all their backs; be something like the religion they profess. The thing that appalls one is that they are all Christians.

That they are of the same kind, we know by our experience as a nation. We have the same kind of people in our states from all these countries of Europe. We have forty-eight nations of them with free movement across all borders. They are quite enough alike here to get along as fellow townsmen in our towns and fellow countrymen in our country. They are so much alike that they intermarry, a degree of intimacy that calls for still greater degree of similarity. It would not be difficult to find families here that have all these warring countries of Europe represented among their sons-in-laws and daughters-in-law, getting along quite as well in this closest human relation as most people do, the same people—relatives here—whose ancestors have furnished the necessary enmity for all the wars of Europe, and still do.

Just now our country is stirred about the activities of those who sell things with which to make war. War seemed quite bad enough in defense of high things said to come in no other way. War seems quite another thing as a branch of the sales department. It seems to be surprisingly large business of those who never let their nationality interfere with sales. They have an international outlook that is truly admirable, working up fighting customers with an indifference to national attachments worthy of the best of causes. There must be a lot to it, judging by the way it is kept out of the papers and off the air. They say it would get us into trouble with foreign countries to tell it all. A cartoonist shows a little bird, the Nye Senate Committee investigating munitions, with the small end of the tail in its mouth, the serpent itself spread out over the landscape as far as you can see, great billows of serpent, part above ground and a part under. It seems to be as big a thing as that. The Senate Committee investigation got it into the news. Most people had not heard of it unless they read *Fortune* or attend the Foreign Policy dinners.

Someone who knows New York shipments says it would take the whole standing army to stop the freight from there to those who are either fighting now or getting ready to fight somewhere. It is about the only business some of the companies have now and they are not giving it up for tender sentiments. Things that go into war making seem to include about everybody's business and not many will take a stand with all needing business so badly. Everyone seems to have some obligation to everyone else in such interdependency that few feel free to go on record against the thing.

There is not much doubt that many would jump into production quite cheerfully if a first-class war would break out now, calling for war stuff from us. Some excuse would be found to make it look like a good war. Life would get cheerful around the clubs again and women would come out in new clothes, all so glad that prosperity had come back. The thing has its tentacles in us as badly as that. There would be new churches built to Christ; ministers and professors of ethics would get their salaries raised.

What we need just now is to put it all on the air in about ten languages, each in his own tongue, in ten countries, just after the children's hour, or whenever it is that most are listening in, true stories for grown-ups, true stories of those nice cemeteries and the rotting dead to make the nights horrible for all the sons and daughters of men. We need this much more than we need lotions and mouth washes. Our hands are more stained than chapped. Our mouths are cleaner than our minds, dirty with the business of getting some ready to kill those they have nothing against, just to keep the sales force busy.

It would help to drop the whole story down in about ten countries, each in his own tongue, the story in words, pictures and figures of how wars are made, what for, who pays, and who gets what. People would read it. Do not doubt, they would read it. Those with the gassed lungs and ghastly faces could read it. Those with one eye, and one leg, and one arm would read it. It would be fine reading for them. Those who are with young would read it and wonder why they are with young. All those who lead male children about would read it and wonder what male children are for.

Concerning Our Attitude Toward Japan

ALAN JENKINS

This article is written in the belief that the attitude of the American people toward Japan in the present critical stage of international relations may still be shaped into something sane and intelligent. Assuming that this is the case, the question follows: how may some of us help so as to shape our national attitude? The first suggestion I make has been made by many others, but it warrants repetition: we can spread recognition of the imperialistic "beam" in Uncle Sam's eye. How many of the people in your neighborhood know the facts brought out in books like Weinberg's *Manifest Destiny?* And, assuming that this general ignorance is a dangerous thing, what are you doing about it? Are you sharing some frank thoughts about our Indian wars? About our war of aggression against Mexico? Are you giving wider currency to the views of men like Grover Cleveland concerning our annexation of Hawaii? Are you reminding your neighbors of the way in which we carved the puppet-state of Panama out of a protesting mother-country? Or of the way in which we crushed the Filipinos in pursuing what McKinley called our policy of "benevolent assimilation" (a phrase good enough for the Japanese Foreign Office)? If our national attitude toward Japan is to gain perspective and balance, such facts must be made plain. True, our neighbors do not like to be told that we, too, have bullied and robbed weaker peoples; that we, too, have found moral phrases to repeat until we have hypnotized ourselves into feeling virtuous. Of course, they do not. But they can "take it." Enough of them, at any rate, to justify our efforts to pour a little of the oil of national self-appraisal upon the sea of

our indignation. Perhaps, too, we can help some of our fellow-citizens to feel a bit humble over the fact that Japan is getting much of her scrap and other war materials from us.

Doubtless most readers of UNITY recognize the fact of diverse Japanese groups. But are *you* spreading such recognition? It is critically important that you should. The trouble with a bomb is its lack of discrimination. It does not know the innocent from the guilty. For a bomb all of us are lumped together and labelled "something to blow up." Some of our thoughts are like that. In 1917, for example, we forgot to differentiate among Germans. We pictured what we called a "Hun"—a brutal, international criminal—and *he* was Germany. That caricature dominated our minds and dictated the unfair terms at Versailles. Today we are in danger of picturing a little brown man with a leer on his face and a grenade in his hand, and calling *that* Japan. If we do, what an absurdity! What of Kagawa and his followers? What of those dreadfully poor peasants and laborers who, should the government totter, might be quick to revolt? Japan seems to present a united front; actually, her present actions on the mainland were probably motivated in part by a desire to sidetrack a bitter discontent at home. And so let us remember, and help others to remember, that there are Japanese—and Japanese. In his day, Jesus found his people lumping all Samaritans together and labelling the bundle "unclean." With this in mind, he told the story of the Good Samaritan. Should not the lesson of that parable find its way into our attitude today toward a country ruled (and we may some day add ruined) by her military class and a small industrial oligarchy?

In our attitude toward Japan let us also find room for pity. In the present struggle there is not just one victim: there are two—the people of China and the people of Japan. The latter are feeling the moral censure of the world; they should be pitied on that score. But there is a deeper reason for compassion. Japan is still a feudal country with a handful of lords dictating the terms of life under which sixty-five million serfs shall live. Only the lords are now called industrial magnates and army chiefs, and the serfs are called peasants, employes and soldiers. If we may trust Freda Utley's recent statements in the *Nation*,* nearly half the serfs of Japan are on the land, and practically all of these are in debt due to the burden of taxes and the payment of high tribute to "parasitic landowners." As a result, the peasants of Japan have been unable, as the same article comments, to modernize their methods; and industry, flourishing only on the export side and in armaments, has been made fantastically lop-sided. And this is just part of a sadly unbalanced economic and social system. Should there not be room, then, for pity in our attitude toward Japan? Though her militarists may win military success (they cannot win any other), her people will lose as they have been losing for a thousand years.

Let us try, then, so to shape the attitude toward Japan in our communities that it will include not only horror but humility because of our own national record, a recognition of diverse Japanese groups, and pity for the masses of Japan. And, yes, let us not be afraid of advocating action. In the first place, as evidence in part of our humility, of the recognition of the beam in our national eye, would it not be wise to withdraw our military forces from China? This—precisely because the press of the world would call us cowards—would be the bravest thing we could do. It would be giving Japan another kind of precedent; it would be in keeping with our State Department's request that our civilians withdraw from the war areas; and it might, in the long run, hearten the Chinese as a vote of confidence in their ability to run their own show. In the second place, as a practical expression of our horror, of our objection to wholesale international murder, I feel that we should refuse to buy that product upon the sale of which the Japanese economy rests—silk. Without our purchase of silk (we take 85 per cent of her product), Japan would lack, as many have pointed out, the foreign exchange with which to buy war materials. I know the objections to this kind of pressure as tantamount to a war measure. But, as far as the Japanese masses go, I fail to see that it would mean starvation. And, as for our courting national danger, inaction in a world like ours has, as our President suggests, its grave risks, too. Certainly a boycott on Japanese silk suggests itself as the most humane form of economic pressure we could exert, and it would, if effective, throw a large moral wrench into the war machinery of Japan. A Japanese Christian is reported to have said recently to an American friend: "Pray for the economic collapse of Japan." What shall we do about a request like that? And, if we want to answer it, should we not do so in the store as well as in the church?

Study Table

Control of the Mediterranean

THE DANGEROUS SEA. *By George I. Slocombe. 286 pp. New York: The Macmillan Company. $2.50.*

In the history of mankind and the evolution of civilization the Mediterranean has played a very important part. It was on the shores of the Mediterranean that great civilizations of the past flourished; and many great conflicts, since the days of the ancient Greeks, the Persians, and the Egyptians, were fought for the control of the Mediterranean. It was the question of the control of the Mediterranean that played an important part in the Napoleonic War. Control of the Mediterranean, as the highway towards India—the heart of the British Empire—is vital to the very existence of the British imperial system and the British foreign policy.

The New Italy, under the leadership of Signor Mussolini, is pursuing a policy of reëstablishing a Roman Empire in Africa, and increasing Italian influence in the Mediterranean, if not to make it an Italian lake. This is one of the causes of the present unsettled situation in Europe. Italy is virtually challenging British supremacy in the Mediterranean. Development of the Italian navy and air-force, the conquest of Abyssinia and the establishment of an Italian naval base in the

*Article on "Japan Fears a Boycott" in the October 2nd issue.

Indian Ocean—not to speak of the recent fortifications by the Italians of various islands in the Mediterranean—have intensified rivalry between Britain and Italy. In fact Italy today is more or less supreme in the Eastern Mediterranean; and Italian intervention in Spain in favor of General Franco is to increase Italian power in the Western Mediterranean through a *de facto* Spanish-Italian understanding, if not an alliance. The situation in the Mediterranean is menacing, in spite of recent Anglo-Italian understanding. This is one of the reasons for Great Britain re-arming and also for taking steps to strengthen the African sea-route to India by establishing strong and fortified naval bases on African coasts. In any conflict between Britain and Italy in the Mediterranean, it will not be so easy for the former to defeat the Italian naval and air-forces, although ultimately, through superior resources of the empire and possibly through blockade, Britain would defeat Italy. But the situation would be more complicated if Italy were to be aided by Germany and Japan.

Mr. Slocombe, in this excellent study of Mediterranean problems, senses the danger which is so grave that it may become a cause of the destruction of western civilization. The book is written objectively, with vigor and vision. Students of international relations and persons interested in the promotion of world peace will find the book interesting and instructive. The book contains valuable information regarding the naval strength of various nations and lucid discussions of such burning questions as British Sea Power and Security, the Conquest of Abyssinia, the problems of the Adriatic, the Balkan Pact and the Little Entente, Turkey, U. S. S. R. and the Straits, the Spanish Civil War, the problems of Palestine, African Colonial problems, and the part that the Mediterranean would play in the next war.

TARAKNATH DAS.

What's Coming in Europe?

EUROPE TODAY. *By Sherwood Eddy. New York: Farrar & Rinehart. $2.00.*

There never was a more unpretentious book than this, and seldom a more timely and valuable one. It is the record, or a part of the record, of last summer's Sherwood Eddy seminar in Europe. For seventeen years, now, Dr. Eddy has been conducting his annual parties of mature students and observers to Europe, to learn at first hand what is going on in this tumultuous world, and if possible what may be coming. It dizzies the imagination to think of the good that Dr. Eddy has done, of the knowledge and understanding he has spread abroad, of the good will he has fostered in this age of confusion, suspicion, and hate. For Dr. Eddy always takes key-people on his journeys, and each one goes away, like a disciple from his master, to spread abroad the tidings. It is a wonderful work, conducted with consummate skill and touching devotion.

This book is the report of the 1937 trip to England, France, Germany, Scandinavia, Russia, with a side-trip by Dr. Eddy himself into Spain. In chapter after chapter, Dr. Eddy gives his impressions of the countries visited, impressions infinitely valuable as set against the background of the experiences through many years of one of the most intelligent and indefatigable globe-trotters of our time. England of course showed a calm if troubled countenance, clouded by the menace of war and the vast armament preparations. In Germany, Dr. Eddy found a disciplined and obedient people, ruled by a dictatorship more firmly seated on the throne of power than ever before. He sees no prospect of any shaking of the Nazi regime—not even the economic troubles present any serious threat to its stability and permanence. Hitler he regards as semi-mad, and holding in his hands the keys of life and death—i.e., of war and peace—for the whole European continent. In Russia the party met the terror. But Dr. Eddy makes a novel and impressive point in stressing that the trouble in Russia lies not at all in the country but only in the Communist party. The ruling group are rent with confusion and dismay, but the people are as united as ever behind Stalin. Dr. Eddy presents a hopeful picture of Russia's future as promised by the uninterrupted economic progress of the nation. A special chapter on the trials and executions discloses Dr. Eddy's conviction that the condemned, some of whom were his friends, were guilty, and that Trotsky is as dangerous as he is brilliant. The chapter on the Scandinavian countries reads like the tale of Dante escaping from the inferno into paradise.

A special feature of this book is found in the addresses given before the seminar by certain distinguished guests. Two of these addresses are remarkable—H. L. Brailsford's, which gives the best survey of the Spanish situation we have seen, and John Macmurray's, which is altogether the most brilliant analysis of the basic significance of the present European crisis that has appeared anywhere in recent years. The one bad feature of the book is in this section—an interview with Lloyd George! Why the old villain should have been received into this company we cannot imagine; what he says is of only the most shadowy interest. Perhaps Dr. Eddy was taking satisfaction in confronting the Welshman with the consequences of his Versailles handiwork!

We commend this book unreservedly to all who would know what is going on in Europe today, and what may be coming there and elsewhere. Dr. Eddy's last words are gloomy—he does not see how the next war can be avoided!—Yet is his spirit unconquerable, and his confidence in the ultimate salvation of mankind as firm as ever.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

(*Continued on page* 100)

AS A CHRISTMAS GIFT
Send UNITY to a new reader
Trial subscription of.....
6 MONTHS for $1.00
A Journal of Free and Critical Opinion

UNITY
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago

For the enclosed dollar, send UNITY as a Christmas gift, for a trial period of six months to

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... State.....

Study Table

(*Continued from page 99*)

Prophets and Poets

MILTON AND WORDSWORTH. *By Sir Herbert J. C. Grierson. 185 pp. New York: The Macmillan Company. $2.50.*

THE GREAT POETS AND THE MEANING OF LIFE. *By Charles A. Dinsmore. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. $2.75.*

These two refreshing books may well be read and pondered together. Each raises the significant question of the psychology of prophecy, inspiration, the thing that makes a great poet. And this is the question with which literary criticism must in the future more and more concern itself. Recently at a meeting called to study creative writing, a well known scholar expressed the wish that a study might be made of what is ordinarily called inspiration. He stated that he had tried all his life to understand why some men were "different," why they had this "prophetic" gift. This is the task the eminent scholar, Sir Herbert Grierson, has undertaken: in what sense is Milton to be reckoned a prophetic poet. Just as the prophets of the Old Testament put into the language and form of poetry their intuitions as these were called out by baffling political and highly emotional religious experiences, so Milton found in his intuitions the theme of his great work. Sir Herbert distinguishes between the "didactic poet" who rationalizes and develops an argument, and the "prophetic poet" who like Dante and Wordsworth reacts intuitively. Sir Herbert concludes after marshaling all his evidence that Milton was not entirely prophetic; too often Milton justified the ways of God to man as would a lawyer. Sir Herbert finds Wordsworth, though a lesser genius than Milton, often to have had the prophetic fire.

A book more easily read by the layman and important for this discussion is *The Great Poets and the Meaning of Life* by the well known author of *The English Bible as Literature,* Charles Allen Dinsmore. The present book includes a discussion of Homer, Aeschylus, Lucretius, Virgil, Dante, Shakespeare, and the Bible. These writers each in his way made a contribution to human culture and each in his way shared the prophetic fire. Just how these prophets made their contributions is told only as Dr. Dinsmore can tell it. Let us hope that both Dr. Dinsmore and Sir Herbert will continue this fruitful study.

C. A. HAWLEY.

The Field

(*Continued from page 86*)

Nazis Visit Our Church

"I would like to bring ten or twelve visiting Nazi students over to our church," telephoned one of my friends. "Could you talk to them a few minutes?"

It was a heavy-scheduled day, but, thought I, the Germans have been cordial to me when I have visited their country; I must be gracious to them. Never a thought in my mind of imposing American propaganda on their youthful Hitlerized minds.

We met in the center of the church auditorium. A fine-looking lot. All of them understood English. Their leader could converse fluently.

"What is the creed of this church?" he inquired. Then I suddenly realized that the Lord had delivered them into my hands.

"We haven't any creed," I replied. "We in this church believe that one of the marks of the mature mind is that it refuses to be regimented. We agree not to think alike (for that is childish), but to walk together. You could have any faith or no faith and be a member in good standing of our society."

The leader looked a bit puzzled. "Well," he inquired, "if you have no creed, what book do you preach from —the Bible?"

"To us, in this church," I answered, "all inspiring literature, whether we find it in the Bible, the writing of Buddha, or Plato, or of some modern poet, is of value. Most of us find, however, that the Bible is the most inspiring of all, because it was written by a people who have made the greatest moral and spiritual contribution to the race, the Jews. Indeed, several Jews are members of our congregation. Several of the Cleveland rabbis are my good friends."

The leader looked a bit stunned. "What do you preach about?" was his final question.

"Anything," I replied, "that is concerned with human life. We believe that all human problems are first of all religious. Some Sundays I talk about the inner life and its cultivation; another Sunday about personal behavior. Again I might preach on some political or economic problem. You see, my congregation may differ radically with me about some of these issues, but I am free to say what I wish, and they are free to accept or reject. If our people thought I 'pussy-footed' (the leader nodded to show that he understood American slang), many of them would leave."

A few more questions . . . a pleasant good-bye. Did the Nazi students realize that I had exposed them to the most terrible of all heresies—the heresy of freedom? I would give a great deal to know what they wrote to their mammas and papas about their visit to the Unitarian Church of Cleveland.

After my visitors had gone, I sat in my study chair and pondered, "We in America are free, the minds of those poor youngsters are in a spiritual jail. They dare not think their own thought. We in America are free. We can praise or damn the Roosevelt administration to our hearts' content; on the Public Square, close by the statue of that old liberal, Tom Johnson, we can shout and rave and demand the overthrow of democracy and the Republic, and a policeman will be there to protect us. We can worship where we please or not at all."

Freedom—that is our great heritage, and it was bought with blood. Freedom—how essential to the realization of our individual and national potentialities.

Life would be intolerable without freedom!

DILWORTH LUPTON,
in The Cleveland Unitarian.

Good News from Russia

(Following are a few words sent out from Moscow, September 1, by Anna Louise Strong, in the *World News* of the Federated Press.—Editor.

"MOSCOW—Arriving at Moscow after a long absence, I find the most important news to be the amazing harvest. It surpasses any for half a century. Good weather plus steadily improving mastery of modern mechanized farm technique has produced a bumper yield.

"The harvest is sufficient to feed the Soviet population for two years and could make the Soviet a wheat factor in the world market if desired. The standard of living has been steadily expanding. The trade turnover is double this year compared to 1934.

"Collectivized farming is proving a definite success and is convincing the entire rural population. Today 92 per cent of the rural population is on Collective farms; 99 per cent of the land area is either in Collective or State farms.

"According to the statistics of the League of Nations, the Soviet Union ranks first in the world in the production of wheat, rye, barley, and potatoes. Four years ago it ranked fourth in sugar beets; it now ranks first, beet production having doubled in the interval. In the midst of troubled times now facing the world, the Soviet Union goes its way confident of strong economic reserves, attained through having successfully achieved Socialist industry and farming."